

Application No.: 10/014390

Case No.: 57091US002

**REMARKS**

The above listed claim amendments along with the following remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action set forth above. Claims 5-12 are pending. Claims 5, 6 and 9 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 have been newly added.

Support for the changes to claim 5 can be found at least in paragraphs 4, 40-45 and 47-54. Support for the changes in claim 6 can be found at least in paragraph 45. Support for the changes in claim 9 can be found at least in paragraphs 47-54. New claims 14 and 15 are supported by at least paragraph 56.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 .**

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Lackritz et al. (US2001/0031133). The invention as presently claimed defines subject matter that is allowable over the prior art of record including Lackritz et al.

The present invention provides a process by which different components of a photocuring system may be selected. Since the light absorbance spectrum of the various components to be used and spectrum of the light source must be related, the process as claimed, of using a database to select components, serves to eliminate non-matching choices as a user progresses through the selection process. The method also provides the ability to visually observe the overlap between the spectrum responses of selected components.

Independent claim 5 has been amended to recite selecting a first component and a second component from a database. While, Lackritz et al. describes a desire to incorporate materials in different layers that have a common wavelength response in order to permit partial curing of both layers it does not teach or suggest the claimed step of selecting components from a database in a method for optimizing the performance of a light curing polymer system. Because Lackritz et al does not teach all of the elements of the present claim, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) is traversed.

Dependent claims 6-9 depend from claim 5 and are allowable for at least that reason as well.

Claim 6 is allowable for additional reasons. Claim 6 requires that wavelength regions be established and a representative name is assigned to each wavelength region. Lackritz et al. does

Application No.: 10/014390

Case No.: 57091US002

not describe naming wavelength regions. Only specific wavelengths are mentioned. Accordingly, because Lackritz et al does not teach all of the elements of the present claim, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is traversed.

Claim 7 is allowable for additional reasons. The present claim requires that a set of wavelengths for each component are identified using the representative names for the wavelength regions into which the component wavelength set fall. Lackritz et al. does not teach the claimed step of identifying sets of wavelengths using the representative names for the wavelength region in which the wavelength set falls. Accordingly, because Lackritz et al does not teach all of the elements of the present claim, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is traversed.

Claim 8 is further allowable for additional reasons. The present claim requires that representative names of the selected first component are compared to the representative names of the plurality of second components so that only a second component having at least one representative name in common with the selected first component can be chosen.

Lackritz et al. describes a desire to select components having wavelength characteristics in common to facilitate partial curing. There is no discussion of how the components are selected. Specifically, Lackritz does not teach the claimed step of comparing the representative names of the first and second components so that only a second component having at least one representative name in common with the selected first component can be chosen. Accordingly, because Lackritz et al does not teach all of the elements of the present claim, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is traversed.

Independent claim 10 recites storing the characteristics of constituents in memory, selecting first and second components, and graphically displaying an area of an overlapping region of the wavelength responses of the first and second components. Lackritz et al. does not teach the claimed step of "storing the characteristics of constituents in memory", including name and wavelength response. No mention of memory, or of memory storage for storing wavelength information about optical components, in a computer is made anywhere in Lackritz et al.

Further, Lackritz et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed step of "graphically displaying, on the same display" the wavelength responses. Rather, Lackritz merely notes that different response characteristics can be exploited to effect separate activation by exposing them to different wavelengths of light. The graph of Fig. 3 is included merely to illustrate that

---

Application No.: 10/014390Case No.: 57091US002

---

different photosensitive molecules have different response characteristics at different wavelengths. There is no discussion of graphically displaying the name and wavelength response of the first and second components as a step in a method of comparing characteristics of components of a light curing system. Accordingly, because Lackritz et al does not teach all of the elements of the present claim, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is traversed.

Dependent claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10 and are allowable for at least that reason.

Claim 5-12 are believed to be in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### **New Claims**

Claims 14 and 15 are directed to the additional steps of presenting on a display a menu for selection of a component from a database. The database includes at least a set of first components of a first component type and a set of second components of a second component type. At least one second component chosen from the set of second components is presented on the display. Each of the chosen at least one second component operates at a second set of wavelengths and has a second wavelength spectrum. The at least one second component is chosen because at least one of said second set of wavelengths is present in the first set of wavelengths. The second component is selected from the at least one second component displayed.

Newly added claims 14 and 15 depend from claims 5 and 10, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for at least this additional reason.

Application No.: 10/014390

Case No.: 57091US002

**Conclusion**

All pending claims are now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

June 10, 2005  
Date

By: Lucy C. Weiss

Lucy C. Weiss, Reg. No.: 32,834  
Telephone No.: (651) 733-1189  
For Robert B. Leonard, Reg. No. 33,946  
Telephone No.: (612) 766-7000

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833